TO EXTEND DEFENDANT'S TIME TO PLEAD CV-08-1831 EMC

\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$}}}\$ ase 4:08-cv-01831-SBA | Document 11 | Filed 04/11/2008 |

Page 1 of 3

1	Plaintiffs Carol Moorhouse and James Moorhouse and Defendant Bracco				
2	Diagnostics Inc. ("BDI"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate				
3	as follows:				
4	The time for Defendant BDI to Answer or otherwise respond to the Civil				
5	Complaint shall be extended. Plaintiffs' counsel has informed counsel for BDI that				
6	Plaintiffs intend to file a motion to remand the case to state court. If Plaintiffs do				
7	file such a motion, the time for BDI to Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs'				
8	Civil Complaint shall be extended from April 11, 2008, to one of the following:				
9	(1) BDI's date to Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Civil Complaint shall				
10	be determined by any Case Management Orders issued by the Judicial Panel on				
11	Multi District Litigation MDL 1909 Judge Dan A. Polster if this case remains in				
12	federal court; or (2) BDI's date to Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Civil				
13	Complaint shall be extended to 15 days after any federal judge enters an order on				
14	the motion to remand if such order remands this case to California state court.				
15	Good cause exists for this continuance as outlined in the accompanying				
16	Declaration of Aggie B. Lee.				
17					
18	DATED: APRIL 11, 2008 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP				
19					
20					
21	By: /s/ Aggie B. Lee Aggie B. Lee				
22	Aggie B. Lee Attorneys for Defendant BRACCO DIAGNOSTICS INC.				
23	DATED: APRIL 11, 2008 LEVIN SIMES KAISER & GORNICK LLP				
24					
25					
26	By: /s/ Lawrence J. Gornick Lawrence J. Gornick				
27	Attorneys for Plaintiffs CAROL MOORHOUSE and JAMES				
28	MOORHOUSE				
	2. STIPULATION OF PLAINTIFFS AND DEFENDANT BRACCO DIAGNOSTICS				

LAimanage/11255/00006/606811/1

Case 4:08-cv-01831-SBA	Document 11	Filed 04/11/2008	Page 3 of 3	
	W 4 FEVOLV VE VO			
PURSUANT TO STIPU	JLATION, IT IS	SO ORDERED.		
DATED:	,2008			
	_			
The Honorable Edward M. Chen United States Magistrate Judge				
		7. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2.		
CTIDI II ATIO	NI OE DI AINITIEES ANI	3. D DEFENDANT BRACCO DE	IA CNOCTICE	

LAimanage/11255/00006/606866/1

Case 4:08-cv-01831-SBA Document 11-2 Filed 04/11/2008

Page 1 of 3

DECLARATION OF AGGIE B. LEE

- I, Aggie B. Lee, declare as follows:
- 1. I am an attorney at law duly authorized to practice before the courts of the State of California and I am an associate with the law firm of Tucker Ellis & West LLP, attorneys for Defendant Bracco Diagnostics Inc. ("BDI"). I have personal knowledge of all of the facts attested to in this declaration and could competently testify thereto if called as a witness in any legal proceeding.
- 2. On March 5, 2008, Plaintiffs Carol Moorhouse and James Moorhouse ("Plaintiffs") filed a complaint in the Superior Court of California, San Francisco County captioned as *Carol Moorhouse*, *et al.* v. *Bayer Healthcare Pharmaceuticals*, *Inc.*, *et al.*, Case No. CGC-08-472878.
- 3. After service of this Complaint, this case was removed to United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. CV08-1831-EMC. BDI consented to such removal.
- 4. This lawsuit involves allegations that Plaintiff Carol Moorhouse contracted nephrogenic systemic fibrosis as a result of exposure to gadolinium-based M.R.I. contrasts allegedly manufactured by BDI and the other named defendants.
- 5. On or about April 8, 2008, counsel for BDI met and conferred with counsel for Plaintiffs regarding the status of the action.
- 6. Plaintiffs' counsel informed counsel for BDI that Plaintiffs intend to file a motion to remand the case to San Francisco County Superior Court.
- 7. BDI intends to file a response to Plaintiffs' motion to remand, if any such motion is in fact filed.
- 8. On April 7, 2008, Defendants General Electric Company and GE Healthcare Inc. informed BDI that they intend to file an Application to Stay All Proceedings Pending Transfer to MDL to stay proceedings in this case pending

transfer to the designated Multidistrict Litigation Court—the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for inclusion in MDL 1909; *In re Gadolinium Contrast Dyes Product Liability Litigation*.

- 9. Plaintiffs' counsel agreed to an extension for BDI to file an Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint for Damages in the above captioned matter from April 11, 2008, to 15 days after any federal judge enters an order on the motion to remand, if such order remands this case back to California state court.
- 10. If, however, this case remains in federal court and is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for inclusion in MDL 1909, BDI's date to Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Civil Complaint shall be determined by any Case Management Orders issued by the Honorable Dan A. Polster of the United States District Court, Northern District of Ohio, the court designated by the Judicial Panel on Multi District Litigation for MDL 1909: *In re Gadolinium Contrast Dyes Product Liability Litigation*.
- 10. Good cause for this continuance exists due to Plaintiffs' stated intention to move to remand this matter, as well as Defendants General Electric Company and GE Healthcare Inc.'s stated intent to file a Motion for Stay pending transfer to MDL 1909: *In re Gadolinium Contrast Dyes Product Liability Litigation*.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration is executed by me on this 11th day of April, 2008, in Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Aggie B. Lee Aggie B. Lee